Man is ultimately self-determining.

—VIKTOR FRANKL

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 52 FEBRUARY, 1964 NUMBER 4

MATURING "CHILDREN" OF THE AGE

> . . . for idealistic as well as realistic thinkers, and even free-thinkers, are but the outcome and the natural product of their respective environments and periods. The ideals of both are only the necessary results of their temperaments, and the outcome of that phase of intellectual progress to which a nation, in its collectivity, has attained.

IF we conceive the progress of mankind to take place as the growth and development of a living organism of thought, we can hardly submit this process to the scalpel of subdivision and analysis. The strands of karmic influence, of egoic differentiation and resource, are too numerous and too subtle in their interrelations to permit such abstraction. And yet, keeping in mind the *elan vital* of the whole, we may think of this evolution in various dimensions.

For example, there is the ever-present influence of past efforts of the Theosophical Movement, embodied in tradition, myth, literature, and folkways. We can no more withdraw this influence from the matrix of social life than we can extract the fibres of the mango from the fruit. It has become part of the common life, nurturing even casual intuitions and giving "culture" whatever force for good it may possess.

Then, there is the more immediate impact of the most recent expression of Theosophy—in the case of the present, the work of H. P. Blavatsky and her colleagues of 1875 and after. Already the

legacy of H.P.B. has been funded and diluted in dozens of ways, by an almost endless array of individuals and groups. The pure line of her teaching exists, and will continue to be preserved by those who recognize its importance to mankind, but the wider spread of her influence in a "secularized"—not to say "compromised"—form, is widely evident. No one is more sensitive to this pervasive effect of H.P.B.'s labors than her serious students, who are almost daily confronted by fragmentary insights, not really hers, nor really *not* hers, which appear in the works of contemporaries of one sort or another. Some perception is there, but it is not, as we say, *straight,* although one might argue that even fragmentary perception is better than no perception at all. There are of course all degrees of this sort of dilution.

How can we speak so confidently of "dilutions" versus pure or "straight" Theosophy? Textual fidelity is not at issue here, so much as philosophic temper. There is a glorious metaphysical clarity in the philosophy recorded by H.P.B. She was sensitive to every nuance in the development of logical thought, and quick to point out deviations from and blurrings of occult verity. Something of this quality is absorbed by her students, such that anything short of a true consistency with the philosophy tends to make them "uncomfortable" and wary. Such feelings arise most naturally when one finds Theosophical ideas borrowed and made use of by people who have not themselves submitted to the discipline of actual *study* of the Secret Doctrine in the form delivered to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The borrowed riches do not have an appropriate setting; the consequence is only a mixture, not a blend, of the thinking of the writer and his sources.

Books and writings of the latter sort present an interesting contrast to the work of independent and more intuitive thinkers—those who, without direct contact with the direct line of Theosophical influence, none the less thrill the student with the wholeness of their approximations of Theosophical ideas. In this case, the correspondences may not be verbal at all, and the terms used by the writer may be a superficial barrier rather than a help to understanding. Yet the insights emerge, and their moral atmosphere gains recognition by its own inward strength.

It is these "idealistic as well as realistic thinkers, and even freethinkers" who, participating independently in the thrust of the cycle,

should claim a particular respect. It is they who, working from the other end of the thin line of evolutionary striving, find, as H.P.B. said in another connection, an inspiration of their own "to solve the universal problems." These individuals must combine in themselves interesting threads of Karma and rare intensities of egoic purpose. First, then, is the will to know and to understand. Second, there is likely to be a personal karmic heritage which brings them into only casual contact with the direct lines of the Theosophical Movement —or, perhaps, with one of the lines of serious dilution, such that they are repelled rather than attracted by it. In addition, there is the possibility that such men have particular functions to perform in relation to large segments of mankind—people of good will who are so caught up in the prevailing assumptions of the age that they cannot be "got at" or helped except in terms of the slow expansion and liberalization of existing ideas. In such relationships, the intuitive individual who tends by karmic heirloom to think spontaneously in terms of spiritual values, however veiled in the existing conceptual vocabulary, may be making a contribution which no one else can make.

What must not be overlooked, in considering the influence of such writers and thinkers, is the moral power generated by the *individual* break-through accomplished by their minds. While, as H.P.B. remarks, "Outside of initiation, the ideals of contemporary religious thought must always have their wings clipped and remain unable to soar higher," there are times when men of manifest altruism press against the limiting conceptions of the age and exhibit a harmony with Theosophical purposes which reaches beyond doctrinal boundaries.

These varying forms of expression of the archaic philosophy—by direct line of transmission, preserved and forwarded without alteration or change of emphasis; in miscellaneous dilution, according to the capacities and Karma of individuals who find themselves more at home in the fringes of the Movement, than at its heart; by the maintenance and continuity of cultural deposit, across many centuries, from the days of Plato until the present; and in the form of sudden intuitions and inspired concepts of philosophy and psychology (the role of the *Nirmanakayas* may make itself felt here)—have been present in the world for long ages, exercising their strength and influence upon all members of the race, by cyclic impact and in proportions which depend upon the age and the souls who go to

make it up. Eventually, these lines of work—arising from the one and true evolutionary impulse—will lose their differentiated character and unite in one great stream, bringing about a renewal of the age when all mankind are of "one lip and one religion"; but meanwhile, until that far-off time of resolution, of choice, fulfillment and unification, the tide of spiritual knowledge will inevitably flow into the channels which the age requires and the Karma of individuals permits.

What can be said about the present? This cycle, if it is to be distinguished at all from the past, may be marked, it seems just to say, by the characteristic effects of awakening Manasic inquiry. The best Theosophical commentary we have on this phase of the present is in H.P.B.'s messages addressed to the American Theosophists, during their conventions held late in the nineteenth century. In the fourth of these communications, she spoke of both the advantages and "perils" of the period, warning that "Psychism, with all its allurements and all its dangers, is necessarily developing among you," and stressing the need for direction of psychic tendencies by the Manasic principle. She concluded: "Watch therefore carefully this development, inevitable in your race and evolution-period so that it may finally work for good and not for evil. . . ."

The replacement of psychic with Manasic function, we might say, will bring increased self-reliance of mind, and eventually lead to a culture or civilization which recognizes and respects independent thinking as the fundamental expression of human kind. This would mean less dependence upon institutional forms, more freedom, both inner and outer, and more spontaneous philosophizing on the part of people generally. In these circumstances, the role of the teacher will naturally become more provocative, and less "directive," more suggestive and less doctrinal, although the classical form of the Wisdom Religion will no doubt remain, with due proportion of principle, doctrine, and devotional teachings which parallel the inner development of those who are on the Path.

But if, in the present, there are developments which truly typify the evolutionary "spurt" that comes with awakening minds, these seem most likely to be found in apparently spontaneous "discoveries" by individuals who, in a very real sense, represent the sweep and meaning of the cycle which will ripen and bear full fruit before the end of the century.

ROOTS OF CHRISTIANITY IN EARLIER FAITHS

SOME versions of Christian teachings still claim to be unique revelations which supersede all preceding faiths. This barrier of finality and superiority is not confined to Christianity, of course, but is a failing known, in psychological degree, to all creedal systems. In Christianity, this attitude took the form of the deification of Jesus and the anthropomorphizing of the spiritual concept of "Son of God"; in other religions it assumed other forms. The Jews claim to be a people chosen of God with a special mission and they yet await their Messiah. Although Muhammad said that there were as many ways to Allah as there were breaths in the children of men and he honored his predecessors, his followers have made his own place a unique one, saying: "There is but one God, and Muhammad is his prophet"—stress being laid on acceptance of Muhammad.

We need not deal with the disastrous historical consequences of these exclusive claims; everyone is well acquainted with them, and more and more people have the conviction that the time has come to reconcile by seeking out the original intent of the respective messengers. And if Judaism had her Ishmaels, Hinduism had her *chandalas*. While proselytism at the point of the sword, factual or commercial, has been the practice of the West, an exclusive isolationism developed in the East which generated a spiritual pride in the higher "castes"—in which intellectual brilliance manifested itself at the expense of compassion. "Am I my brother's keeper?" was asked by Cain; and the answer is, Yes, you are.

It is time to lay aside all claims of superiority of hereditary descent, and of unique revelations, and examine dispassionately the documents and records that have come down to us. The object of this paper is to show that Christian teachings have their roots in various faiths and philosophies current at the time of its inception. One of the greatest difficulties which faces Christians in accepting the teachings of antiquity is the belief in the actual historicity of the

Gospel stories. A clear line should be drawn between the acceptance of the appearance of a great spiritual figure in Judea who became the focus for a new synthesis of religious thought and aspiration and the record of his life and date as presented in the Gospels. All the historians of that period, Philo Judæus, Josephus, Plutarch, and Dion Cassius are silent on Jesus. Josephus' remarks are obvious interpolations. That fact does not make Jesus, however, a myth. It merely shows that the Gospel stories are built up from a variety of sources, most of which are traceable, and from which one can deduce that the actual person who acted the part of a veritable saviour must have appeared some time earlier than the date assigned in these texts. It must be remembered that the Gospels were composed long after the alleged period but, apart from the discrepancies between the synoptists themselves, certain statements made by them cannot be made to fit contemporary historical facts. King Herod would not have dared to issue any order to kill all the male babies. Rome would have deposed him at once, but one hundred years earlier King Jannæus did persecute and kill many "Innocents," the name given to the initiates.

This date, about 100 B.C., agrees with that recorded in the Jewish Gemara division of the Talmud, which speaks of a certain Jehoshuah ben Pandira as the father of Jesus. Jesus, it is said, had to flee with his teacher to Egypt on account of the persecution of the "Little Ones," the initiates. St. Paul was also called the "little one," and the literalists have thought he was of small stature. A curious statement in the Bible says that King Saul was one year old when he began to reign. This becomes clear if the "one year" refers to his second birth as an initiate, one year having gone by. But the Gospel story also reflects the traditional story told of the birth of Krishna, whose uncle, King Kansa, tried to slay him, and to make sure, ordered that all the male infants should be put to death. St. Paul must have been a good distance in time removed from the actual date of Jesus or he would not have written to the Galatians as he did. He says to them, "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you? Shall you, who in the beginning looked to the Christ-Spirit, now end by believing in a Christ of flesh?" For if the words of St. Paul have any meaning, expressed even more definitely in his second epistle to the Corinthians—"Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more"—it points to the fact that St. Paul recognised that it was not the historical figure, whoever he

was, but the spiritual light focussed through him that was important.

Again, he speaks to the Galatians as little children "of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you." He says to them also, "Christ liveth in me" and to the Corinthians he says "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature." We need scarcely repeat in addition his well-known words, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you." This compares with Krishna's words to Arjuna in *The Bhagavad-Gita*: "I am in the hearts of all men." And again he says, "There dwelleth in the heart of every creature the Master Iswara." Iswara the Lord, and Christ the Lord are undoubtedly names of the same great principle in nature which the Greek philosophers termed the *logos,* or the Word and the Hindus *Vach* or *Sabda Brahman,* the manifested Word. But before proceeding to show where St. Paul got his ideas, we will return to the evidences of the roots of Christian doctrines.

It takes nothing away from Christianity, but rather enhances its significance, to understand that it arose out of a great blending of philosophic and religious thought that had been concentrating in that Mediterranean area for centuries. The basis laid by Pythagoras spread far and wide and linked up with the ancient Chaldean wisdom. The Nazarenes were descendants of Chaldean initiates. The Nazars were the Magi or wise men. They would not accept the Jehovah worship, and they were rejected by orthodox Jewry, hence the New Testament allusion to no good coming out of Nazareth. The title "Jesus of Nazareth" meant more than a name to denote his birthplace, it also stated he was a Nazar. Paul was also accused in Acts of being "a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes."

Asoka's missionaries had come to Asia Minor, Greece, and Egypt, carrying their message of Buddhism, and the Nazarenes of Jesus' time had adopted Buddhism—as is stated in their *Codex Nazaræus.* One sect of the Nazarenes was called the Ebionites. At that time their leader was John who, because of his particular rite of Baptism, became known as John the Baptist. The disciples of St. John have remained a separate community to this day and are known as Mendeans. They do not believe in the divinity of Jesus but consider him as one of the great Prophets. The Mendeans still hold to the original gospel of Matthew, now lost to the church; when St. Jerome saw it he admitted that it was a secret work and differed entirely from the canonical text.

In addition to the teachings that Jesus must have acquired from the Nazars he is also shown by the Gospel narrative to have gone to Egypt. There he would acquire the knowledge of the Essenes and Therapeutae, or healers, as well as that of the Pythagoreans.

That Jesus had a secret teaching is openly stated by St. Mark, who makes him say, "Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the Kingdom of God, but unto them that are without all these things are done in parables." The teachings of the mystery schools and their dramatic presentations of great spiritual, cosmic and planetary truths are shadowed forth in the Gospel stories when their allegorical system is deciphered. The same key of symbology and allegory will open many hitherto closed doors in other great scriptures. But the very drama of the crucifixion and resurrection is itself drawn directly from the Mysteries, as it typifies the life-story of the spiritual ego in every man. The self of each of us is crucified in this body of living flesh, full of desires and instincts and a wayward mind, truly a fourfold cross from which the Christ within has to rise triumphant in its resurrection thereby raising man to a full self-conscious life in spirit. The Gospel stories also bear many traces of the influence of the Buddhist legends. There were many more than four gospels written, but only four became canonical. Those who take the stories literally are evidently unaware that even the sayings of Jesus given therein can be paralleled; the essence of the Sermon on the Mount is found in earlier Jewish and Pythagorean sources.

The Gospel which clearly stresses the gnostic aspect is that of St. John, opening with the magnificent pronouncement of the logos or Word as the chief principle in Cosmos and man. St. Paul in Colossians has much to say on this when he speaks of the cosmic aspect of the Christ thus: "By him all things were created." He is "the image of the invisible God" and "the first-born of every creature," that is, the archetype. No doubt St. Paul got the concept from the Jewish Kabalists, as he refers to their doctrine of Emanations and even names them in Colossians "Thrones, Dominions, Principalities and Powers." These are names of some of the Kabalistic Sephiroth of which there were ten. They in turn correspond to the Hindu *prajapati* or creators, also ten in number. This linking up of the logos doctrine with the Christ is the crucial mark of the original source from which Christianity derives. We shall conclude with a reference on this point but it should be carefully noted that the name Christ was in use five centuries before the Christian era. The original word

was *Chrestos;* and Justin Martyr, Lactantius, Clement of Alexandria spoke of the Chrestians or *Chrestianoi;* the term Christian was not current. The Acts admit it was first used during St. Paul's visit to Antioch, A.D. 44, and then it was applied as a nickname in derision for carnalizing a purely subjective principle, the Christ or *Christos.* (It is important to recognize the great difference between the two Greek words *chrestos* and *christos.* The word *chrestos* runs through Greek literature from 500 B.C. onwards, but it had the meaning not merely of a 'good man' as Clement defines it but of an adept in its usage in the temple phraseology, i.e. one in and through whom God spoke oracles. Both Aeschylus and Euripides used it in this sense.)

Coming to times after the birth of Christ, we find Celsus the Epicurean in the 2nd century affirming that "the Christian religion contains nothing but what Christians held in common with heathens, nothing new." In A.D. 170 Bishop Melito of Sardis addressed the Emperor Marcus Aurelius and claimed his patronage on the grounds of the great antiquity of the Christian religion. Justin Martyr made a similar overture to the Emperor Adrian in his *Apology,* referring therein to the virgin birth, crucifixion and the rising from the dead as being the same as that averred of the sons of Jove, that "the son of God" was a justifiable title, that it had been given to Mercury and other messengers. St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, in the fourth century said: "What is now called the Christian religion really was known to the ancients. Nor was it wanting at any time from the beginning of the human race . . . but as having in later times received this name." Even Eusebius had to admit that Christianity "if it be lawful to testify, was known to the ancients." Faustus, the great Manichean, wrote to St. Augustine: "You have substituted your *agapae* for the sacrifice of the pagans, for their idols, your martyrs . . . you celebrate the same festivities . . . Nothing distinguishes you from the pagans except that you hold your assemblies apart from them."

We now pass to doctrines assumed to be Christian. Baptism was a universal custom. It should be known that the cruel verse attributed to Jesus in St. Mark's gospel "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved and he that believeth not shall be damned" does not appear in the oldest Greek manuscripts. Such un-Christlike words are a later interpolation, but for these hundreds of years they have been the authority for much ill-placed missionary enterprise.

The Eucharist or Lord's Supper had its origin in the Soma drink of the initiated priests of India. It was a symbol of the Secret Wisdom. From India it passed to Egypt. There the rite was accompanied with the cakes of Isis, identical with the consecrated wafer of today. The Trinity is another universal teaching representing the great pantheistic ideal of the Unknown Essence, which transforms itself first into subjective and then objective matter. It was only in the second century A.D. that Jesus Christ was suggested by Justin Martyr as the second person of the trinity and only in the fourth century was this version adopted in the Athanasian creed, making Jesus coexistent with God.

To return to the term *chrestos*. It meant a priest or prophet, a term more applicable to Jesus than that of Christos—which is supposed to be derived from *christ* etymologically, meaning the anointed one; but on the authority of the Gospels he was never anointed either as priest or king. In the *Stromata,* Clement of Alexandria says: "All who believe in Chrest (a good man) both are and are called Chrestians, that is, good men." As a gnostic, Clement must have known that Christos was "the way," while Chrestes was the one journeying toward that great goal of Christos representing the glorified spirit of Truth, the reunion which makes the soul (the Son) one with the Father Spirit. As already pointed out, St. Paul in Galatians takes this meaning of the Christ and also in Ephesians where he says: "That you may find Christos in your inner man through knowledge (pistis)." The name *Christos* is pre-Christian and it is found in the tablet containing the prophecy of the Erythrean Sibyl, in a verse taken from the mystic catechism, referring to the coming down on earth of the Spirit of Truth, *"Iesous Chreistos theou huios soter stauros,"* meaning literally, "Iesus Christos Son of God, Saviour, Cross." This would be wonderful as a Christian prophecy except for the fact that it is undoubtedly pagan. Aesculapius was the divine physician, the Healer or *Soter,* that is, saviour. He was the son of Apollo the solar God, and *Iaso* his daughter was the goddess of healing. The candidates for initiation into her father's temple were called Chrestoi, the sons of Iaso. The sibyl's words thus mean simply: "Son of Iaso, Chrestos, the priest or servant of the Son of the God Apollo, the Saviour from the Cross (of flesh or matter)."

To come to our closing point, all these legends are built on one teaching, the voluntary sacrifice of the logoi, whose rays incarnated in mankind. In the Vedas it is Visvakarman, the architect of the

world, who sacrifices himself to himself (i.e. the world) in order to save it, and thus becomes Vikartanna, shorn of his rays. He had to wear the crown of thorns while crucifying his body ere he could rise to be reborn as the glorified "Light of the World."

The following quotation from *The Secret Doctrine,* H. P. Blavatsky's monumental work, is given because it touches the very core of all great religions, reveals the secret of their strength, reconciles them all, and shows how, like the great Saviours themselves, the universal truths about Man's origin and destiny have become dwarfed and split up into innumerable fragments, all differing in their outer garb yet all capable of being restored to their proper place in harmony with all the others. H.P.B. writes:

> When mortals shall have become sufficiently spiritualised, there will be no more need of *forcing* them into a correct comprehension of ancient Wisdom. Men will *know* then, that there never yet was a great World-reformer, whose name has passed into our generation, who (*a*) was not a direct emanation of the Logos (under whatever name known to us), *i.e.,* an *essential* incarnation of one of "the seven," of the "divine Spirit who is sevenfold"; and (*b*) who had not appeared before, during the past Cycles. They will recognise, then, the cause which produces in history and chronology certain riddles of the ages; the reason why, for instance, it is impossible *for them* to assign any reliable date to Zoroaster, who is found multiplied by twelve and fourteen in the *Dabistan;* why the Rishis and Manus are so mixed up in their numbers and individualities; why Krishna and Buddha speak of themselves as *re-incarnations, i.e.,* Krishna is identified with the Rishi Narayana, and Gautama gives a series of his previous births; and why the former, especially, being "the *very supreme* Brahmâ," is yet called *Amsamsavatara*—"a part of a part" only of the Supreme on Earth. Finally, why Osiris is a great God, and at the same time a "prince on Earth," who reappears in Thoth-Hermes, and why Jesus (in Hebrew, Joshua) of Nazareth is recognised, cabalistically, in Joshua, the Son of Nun, as well as in other personages. The esoteric doctrine explains it by saying that each of these (as many others) had first appeared on earth as one of the seven powers of the Logos, individualized as a God or "Angel" (messenger); then, mixed with matter, they had reappeared in turn as great sages and instructors who "taught the Fifth Race."

letters • questions • comment

I noted in Manas *for October 9 a somewhat appreciative commentary on psychologist B. F. Skinner, whose utopian novel* Walden Two *has been provocative of so much discussion since its publication in 1948. Dr. Skinner, as an avid and "utter" materialist—that is, one who believes a better ethical life must be conditioned into existence by environmental manipulation—is automatically criticized by Theosophists. Actually, though, H. P. Blavatsky makes a strong statement in* The Key to Theosophy *on behalf of those who seek to improve the condition of humanity through the "planned environment" approach: "True evolution teaches us that by altering the surroundings of the organism we can alter and improve the organism; and in the strictest sense this is true with regard to man."*

The nineteenth-century conception of human evolution is still dominant today and, philosophically, it is in one sense a further projection of those political schemes for betterment which began at the ideative level in the seventeenth century and reached active political formulation in the nineteenth. This view is that human beings become "better" *collectively,* that the *species* should evolve step by step toward a nobler conception of justice, a keener sensitivity to truth, beauty, and goodness. The Theosophical view is concerned with the evolution of the individual soul, and emphasizes each man's capacity to alter and transform his attitudes toward learning, whatever the adverse nature of the circumstances in which he finds himself.

In the *Vedas* and the *Bhagavad-Gita,* we note a description of the "Tree of Life," that mysterious symbol which pictures the process of creation as having "roots above and its branches below." One application of this means of depicting the course of evolution as proceeding "from the top downward" is to look for that in every human being which is *presently* capable of knowing an ideal far beyond the capacity to make it manifest in daily life. In other words, the soul, because it is soul, has timeless vision. Immersed in the conflicting

impulses which arise from incarnation in material circumstances, the brightness of this vision is dimmed. On rare occasions, when the soul lives on its own plane, so to speak, we are reminded of the innate ability for self-forgetfulness, for impersonality in relation to devotion to justice, etc. Every human being at his highest and best moments becomes something more than merely human; he *is* Christ, he *is* Buddha, he *is* an Adept or Mahatma.

So, as the *Upanishads* put it, he cycles upward and downward through dreamland, now rejoicing and now grieving—but as a part of this cycle he also is for a while beyond joy and beyond grief, living in the "timeless state." Furthermore, again in terms of the *Dhammapada* and the *Vedas,* every night of normal human existence opens the door to "the timeless state." In dreamless sleep, and at a moment following the death of the body, and at another moment preceding the birth into a new body, the same state of being momentarily prevails. The visions of the ultimate sort, then, are not reached by arithmetical progression as the "species" becomes "better," but are presently within the man; no one must lead us by the hand forward to the Promised Land, for "the promised land" is a way of looking at things, and the determinant is our own capacity to look within and establish psychological residence.

According to Hastings *Encyclopedia of Religion,* the word "soul" stands for the Theosophical view: "The word 'soul' in its primary meaning, designates an entity conceived as the cause or vehicle of the bodily life and psychical activities of the individual person." B. F. Skinner feels that religious and metaphysical speculations have turned men's attention away from the need to build the "Heavenly City" here on earth, as, for instance, when he remarks: "All differences are physical. We think with our bodies, too." This language is understandable as a reaction to too much religion based upon the thought that the good life is to be reached *after* the present life has been discarded. But the Theosophical teaching, the teaching of the "soul" as the real man, intimates that we can improve a society only as we find out how to nourish and sustain man's spiritual intuitions. We *have* the moments of spiritual vision, but cannot keep them. We need to know how to interpret them, how to practice the meditative and contemplative disciplines which link our times of highest perception with a philosophy that will sustain us during the "downward" phases of our eternally recurring evolutionary cycles.

ON FIRST ACQUAINTANCE— "THE SECRET DOCTRINE"

VIII

> Maya or illusion is an element which enters into all finite things, for everything that exists has only a relative, not an absolute, reality, since the appearance which the hidden noumenon assumes for any observer depends upon his power of cognition. To the untrained eye of the savage, a painting is at first an unmeaning confusion of streaks and daubs of colour, while an educated eye sees instantly a face or a landscape. (*The Secret Doctrine* I, 39.)

THE evolution and gradually widening scope of our cognition through personal effort and study may be seen on those occasions when we sincerely try to accomplish an altruistic and sacrificial act or effort; but upon its accomplishment, combined with a certain amount of retrospection, we discover that our original motivations were not really so altruistic as we had thought. Thus, the earnest student is likely to find that selfishness is hidden by degrees in the human heart, that it cannot be discarded in one fell swoop, for it is not *discovered* in that fashion.

If it is likely that the subtle forms of selfishness are more powerful in their degrading effects than the more obvious ones, this might lead us to a deeper appreciation of those many descriptions of "chelas who failed." The casual readers of Theosophical literature may be apt to discount some of the more horrific descriptions of failure in the life of an occultist, regarding them as exaggerations to emphasize the need for virtue, yet a deeper inspection may bring the perception that these "tales of failure" are actually an important warning that we have yet to know what "altruism" is; that our present state of discrimination is such that most efforts we make are to *some* extent mistaken ones. To say that we need only to listen to the "voice" of our conscience is easy enough, but to say that we have heard it in an unobscured way is quite a different claim.

When we separate ourselves from our fellows so that we can "lead" them or help them—this may be an example of distorted altruism. After all, if we can lead them to being good, somebody else can lead them to being bad; yet if somehow we transmit the

idea that they have omnipotent help and ever-present leadership within themselves, this may be best of all. Even if we caused a person to become an enemy, who knows but that we might still have rendered him a profound favor in convincing him of his own inner potential and the need of self-reliance.

People of a literal bent judge events by surface appearances, and therefore misunderstand them, failing to consider the long-term effect of a word or action upon a man's life; a crop of deeper effects may accrue in the harvest cycle.

If we can become comfortable with the idea that the cycle is an entire lifetime and not a month or year, then it might be useful to study the daily currents and their journey into the realm of sense, for the thoughts we push into the visible world set the stage for ourselves and our environment. We are constantly making our world and our environment, yet who of us gives sufficient attention to thoughts and speech? How many times have we gone chasing after some *special* wisdom?

The slow day-to-day work of examining our thoughts and their expression is a task that we often begin only when driven into a mental corner, a cul-de-sac from which there is no exit but self-reform. H.P.B. has said of Theosophy that it is—

> . . . essentially the philosophy of those who suffer, and have lost all hope of being helped out of the mire of life by any other means. Moreover, the history of any system of belief or morals newly introduced into a foreign soil, shows that its beginnings were impeded by every obstacle that obscurantism and selfishness could suggest. "The crown of the innovator is a crown of thorns" indeed! No pulling down of old, worm-eaten buildings can be accomplished without some danger. (*The Key to Theosophy*, pp. 37-8.)

Is this not the way of our personality, that through selfishness and obscuration it blocks our efforts? The mind, having been a slave in its "downward" choices for such a long period, is not easily re-oriented; all attention has to be gradually drained from the kamic mental life into the growth of that small reservoir of altruism within. Like draining and reclaiming swampland for productive planting, this is a slow and gradual process.

We cannot have succes at this if we take up the work in the sense of "personal" progress or personal reform—for our re-*form* is in

order to re-*join* the human race, not to move away from it; it is the process of transforming one's self:

> The one self has to forget itself for the many selves. Let me answer you in the words of a true Philaletheian, an F.T.S., who has beautifully expressed it in the Theosophist: "What every man needs first is to find himself, and then take an honest inventory of his subjective possessions, and, bad or bankrupt as it may be, it is not beyond redemption if we set about it in earnest." But how many do? All are willing to work for their own development and progress; very few for those of others. To quote the same writer again: "Men have been deceived and deluded long enough; they must break their idols, put away their shams, and go to work for themselves—nay, there is one little word too much or too many, for he who works for himself had better not work at all; rather let him work himself for others, for all. For every flower of love and charity he plants in his neighbour's garden, a loathsome weed will disappear from his own, and so this garden of the gods—Humanity—shall blossom as a rose. In all Bibles, all religions, this is plainly set forth—but designing men have at first misinterpreted and finally emasculated, materialized, besotted them. It does not require a new revelation. Let every man be a revelation unto himself. Let once man's immortal spirit take possession of the temple of his body, drive out the money-changers and every unclean thing, and his own divine humanity will redeem him, for when he is thus at one with himself he will know the 'builder of the Temple.'" (*Key* p. 53.)

We see in this quotation one of the paradoxes of self-sacrificial work for the environment in general; we become more naturally ourselves by "losing" our personal life. In using our days to help on man's salvation, we re-enter and rejoin *a real part of ourselves*—a Father, a Guide, and Invisible Friend who helps us in the strangest ways, *and also protects us.* Order begins to overtake our life and we see both our pain and pleasure as being integral with destiny. This "something" that is more us than that which we usually label "I," if we follow *it* and ignore the multitude of outside voices, advisers, helpers, etc., we will be crucified by the outside and remade by the *Inside.*

Yet, unless we listen to the inner voice, *first,* and to the outer, *only when it echoes what we hear inside,* the confusion and impenetrable idiocy of our life will not dissipate. However, it is in this search for truthful echoes that many have come to love the work of H.P.B., as a sound from the outer that does not clash nor obscure the inner, but on the contrary, makes a harmony with It.

The help of Theosophic study may gradually melt our unbelieving minds, for just as Christ is reported to have said, "Believe and you will understand," so H.P.B. added, "Study and you will believe." Here we may see a kind of belief or faith that comes closer to intuition than blind acceptance—an attitude that carries its own protection.

Intuition has been said to be the sudden seeing of connections and meaningful coherence among (apparently) unrelated parts. The ability to see larger "wholes" is to penetrate the veil-of-separateness. If this is so, then it might be that a critical analysis of *The Secret Doctrine* neither illuminates its *message* nor protects us from gullibility, for if we are continually critical and "keep up our guard," we tend to shut out that which is revealed when the element of "trust" enters into our studies; and also, there may be a more subtle way of protecting ourselves against gullibility.

Let us suppose that this *more subtle way* is akin to the more sublime aspects of "love." For instance, if we love a friend we also know that friend's faults, but these faults somehow aren't crucial to the total picture of our friendship; we can recognize them, be protected against them, but still not do overt battle.

"Love" is a mysterious word and does strange things when observed as an element of study or philosophical research. It is said that Thomas Taylor understood the philosophy of Plato more deeply than many, not because of his Greek erudition but because he loved Plato. If we love the Secret Doctrine as a close and daily friend, discarding ideas of learning or of becoming erudite students, it too may be able to "love" us; for the Teachings speak to those who listen and are concerned. We should come to this study, and stay for a while, allowing the rational side of ourselves to be perplexed if need be, but remembering that this state is not relevant, or is at least a livable condition when it occurs in a state of friendship:

> "Unto thee *who findeth no fault* I will now make known this most mysterious knowledge, coupled with a realization of it, which having known thou shalt be delivered from evil." When the one who desires to learn is not in a critical attitude, when he has sensed in one way or another that truth lies in a certain direction and gives all his attention to it without quarreling with terms or the ideas put forward, his is the attitude of the true student. (*Universal Theosophy*, p. 11.)

Yet each of us must hew his own road and cannot depend upon another to tell him how or what to study. As H. P. Blavatsky put it:

> It is our decided impression and conviction, that to become a genuine spiritual entity, which that designation [MAN] implies, man must first *create* himself anew, so to speak—i.e., thoroughly eliminate from his mind and spirit, not only the dominating influence of selfishness and other impurity, but also the infection of superstition and prejudice. The latter is far different from what we commonly term *antipathy* or *sympathy*. We are at first irresistibly or unwittingly drawn within its dark circle by that peculiar influence, that powerful current of magnetism which emanates from ideas as well as from physical bodies. By this we are surrounded, and finally prevented through moral cowardice —fear of public opinion—from stepping out of it. It is rare that men regard a thing in either its true or false light, accepting the conclusion by the free action of their own judgment. Quite the reverse. The conclusion is more commonly reached by blindly adopting the opinion current at the hour among those with whom they associate. (*Isis Unveiled* I, 39.)

As study helps us to "believe," so those areas to which we turn our attention affect the direction of our belief. One who filled his time with a study of Madame Blavatsky's works might not be up on the latest newspaper headlines and other mundane affairs, yet be quite up-to-date in a less evanescent sphere of knowledge.

TRANSCENDENT ANTICIPATIONS

The spirit of human brotherhood and the urge to move forward and upward are not to be described in terms of chemical constitution and physical forces, but they are facts, nevertheless, just as real as the need for food, the love of comfort, or the fear of pain. As facts they differ from those of the so-called natural sciences, because they are concerned with consequences rather than being determined by antecedent causes. One could almost say that they are made not of matter, but of time and spirit because their chief constituents are memories of the past, anticipation of the future, and choice of values.

—RENÉ DUBOS

YOUTH FORUM

There comes a time when one feels surfeited with the vast number of words, some bitter, many oversweet, none satisfying, which compose our social and literary diet. Even the wise words of the ancients are taken by most people with a grain of salt, because the continuing existence of apathy, insanity, and absurdity, is taken as indication that all their wisdom has brought about little practical good for mankind. But more particularly and acutely, as a person looks back and remembers his own words—his own efforts and failures to help some other person through words of advice and encouragement—he wonders, Can words really help anyone; or rather, is not the help they sometimes do bring usually outweighed by the sense of unreality, of mental abstraction, of emptiness, which seems so often to accompany them?

Although it is meaningless to speak of "primitive" languages, since linguistic complexity is unrelated to cultural level and some "savage" tribes have as highly developed a language as the European nations, one could make a case for the theory that our own language is on the way to becoming "primitive"—and this, in spite of the mass of technical jargon. The reason is that words are beginning to lose their meaning for us. This highly dangerous situation may be due in part to the fact that our age has created so many monstrosities that we have become afraid to call them by their true names. When, for example, we recall the Nazis' uses of such innocent words as "purification," we wonder if Orwell was after all not right in predicting that the perversion of social man would be accompanied, if not in part caused, by a perversion of language.

This is not to say that this process is inevitable, nor that a general change in attitude could not reverse it overnight. When William Q. Judge said that "our chains are through thought, our release due to nothing else," he could perhaps just as easily have been speaking about words—those mysterious entities which we often refer to

as the "clothing" of thought, but which are so closely bound up with its very essence that we cannot be even aware of a thought without at the same moment being aware of the words which express it. One might suggest, therefore, that words are more the "flesh" of a thought than merely its "clothing," and that only the pure essence of thought—that original motion in the darkness—is beyond the range of human words.

Yet if that mysterious core of the mental process has always eluded the confines of words, it nevertheless seems that the pursuit of this essence is the unconscious goal of all serious speech, for it alone can endow that speech with life, or meaning. And thus we are led to a central paradox, that although words are necessary, they are obstacles; although they allow men to communicate, they restrict that communication; and although we do not really know what we mean until we have forced our feelings into words, the subtlest nuances of what we mean refuse to be so confined. Especially in poetical and philosophical considerations, a single misplaced comma (let alone an inappropriate word) can so distort the image of a truth as to make it seem inapplicable to human life; yet, as already indicated, we must recognize that in a sense *all* words are inappropriate, for they inevitably call up mental pictures that impress themselves upon the "mental retina" and so obscure the very reality they are trying to evoke. When, for instance, we speak of the human soul as a "ray" from the Spiritual "Sun," we are pointing towards a truth and yet away from it at the same time. The poet, Rilke, who often addresses the central mystery of life as he might a close friend, expresses much this same idea:

> Only a thin wall is between us,
> by accident; for it could be
> that one call from your or my mouth
> and it would break down
> without any noise or sound.
> Of your pictures it is built.

Words, then, being such relative things, cannot help forming a wall between ourselves and the Absolute; yet we are not in an impossible situation; the wall can be made very thin, if the words we choose are the most suggestive, honest and precise—the most "porous"—that we can think of. But words are not enough; our aspira-

tion must be so strong that we are willing to force ourselves to keep an ear pressed to that wall every day, every hour, every minute; so that when some slight sign at last is given, we will hear it.

One sure way to sharpen our listening power is to make constant effort to define every vague and wistful feeling that drifts through our souls, to strike out and swim, head above water, refusing to follow easy formulas, the nudgings of sense, and the whisperings of selfish desires. Or perhaps the word "define" is inappropriate, since, before it is possible to judge and classify any of the entrants into our psychic aura, the first step must be the attitude of open recognition; we can neither converse with nor combat that which we do not recognize, and to recognize danger in ourselves often seems beyond us.

Often we do not wake ourselves up to this danger until we see someone else drowning, perhaps someone we love. And then at once we try to help; we use our words as an arm to support that person, to help him to find courage to keep struggling against the undertow of inertia and defeatism. If our words of advice and encouragement are not accepted, what do we do then? Let the matter rest? Turn away lamenting that words never helped anyone? Surely, if we really are able to give up on another human soul, we should at least be honest and admit that the fault lies in the quality of our love and in the depth of our understanding (if these two are not, after all, synonymous); that is to say, the fault lies in the fact that we ourselves are drowning. For if we were completely alive, the force of love would drive us hard against the walls which separate us from the rest of life, walls within ourselves, walls between ourselves and others; would drive us till those walls broke down, letting real communication happen, and finally, communion. And if we spoke, we would find we were not commenting, but acting; our words would become a powerful force, because we would gather them all together, as an offering, and then take the great risk and add our life to the sum.

THE PLANETARY WORLDS

THE Worlds are built "in the likeness of older Wheels"—i.e., those that existed in preceding Manvantaras and went into Pralaya, because the Law for the birth, growth, and decay of everything in Kosmos, from the Sun to the glow-worm in the grass, is ONE. It is an everlasting work of perfection with every new appearance, but the Substance-Matter and Forces are all one and the same. The one eternal Law unfolds everything in the (to be) manifested Nature on a sevenfold principle; among the rest, the countless circular chains of worlds, composed of seven globes, graduated on the four lower planes of the world of formation (the three others belonging to the Archetypal Universe). First, there is diffused Cosmic Matter. Then the fiery "whirlwind," the first stage in the formation of a nebula. That nebula condenses, and after passing through the various transformations, forms a Solar Universe, a planetary chain, or a single planet, as the case may be.

Every Universe (world or planet) has its own Logos, says the doctrine. According to the Occult Doctrine, Venus or Lucifer (also Sukra and Usanas), is our Earth's primary. Every world has its parent star and sister planet. Venus or Lucifer is the light-bearer of our Earth, in both its physical and mystic sense: the *occult* sister and alter-ego of the Earth. Earth is the adopted child and younger brother of Venus, but its inhabitants are of their own kind. Every change on Sukra (Venus) is felt on, and reflected by, the Earth. The archaic tradition states that Venus changes simultaneously (geologically) with the Earth; that whatever takes place on the one takes place on the other. Every active power or force of the Earth comes to her from one of the seven Lords. Light comes through Sukra (Venus), who receives a triple supply, and gives one-third of it to the Earth. Therefore the two are called "Twin-sisters," but the Spirit of the Earth is subservient to the "Lord" of Sukra.

That which is meant by the allegorical sentence, *"Fiat Lux"* is,

---

NOTE.—A student's collation from *The Secret Doctrine*.

when esoterically rendered—"Let there be the 'Sons of Light,' " or the noumena of all phenomena. These beings are the "Sons of Light," because they emanate from, and are self-generated in, that infinite Ocean of Light, whose one pole is pure *Spirit* lost in the absoluteness of Non-Being, and the other, the Matter which it condenses, crystallizing into a more and more gross type as it descends into manifestation. Centers of Forces at first, the invisible sparks of primordial atoms differentiate into molecules, and become Suns—passing gradually into objectivity—gaseous, radiant, cosmic, the one "Whirlwind" (or motion) finally giving impulse to the form, and the initial motion, regulated and sustained by the never-resting Breaths—the Dhyan Chohans. The "Breath" of all the "Seven" is said to be light-making, because they (the planets) were all comets and suns in their origin. They evolve into Manvantaric life from primeval Chaos (now the noumenon or irresolvable nebulae) by aggregation and accumulation of primary differentiations of the eternal matter, according to the beautiful expression in the Commentary, "Thus the Sons of Light clothed themselves in the fabric of Darkness." They are called allegorically "the Heavenly Snails," on account of their (to us) formless INTELLIGENCES inhabiting unseen their starry and planetary homes, and, so to speak, carrying them as the snails do along with themselves in their revolution.

It is said by Krishna, the *Logos* incarnate, in *The Bhagavad-Gita,* "The seven great Rishis, the four preceding Manus, partaking of my nature, were born from my mind; from them sprang (emanated or was born) the human race and the world." Here, by the seven great Rishis, the seven great rupa hierarchies or classes of Dhyan Chohans, are meant. Let us bear in mind that the seven Rishis are of the same nature as the angels of the planets, or the seven great Planetary Spirits. They were all reborn, all men on Earth in various Kalpas and races.

It is with the Regent, the informing Dhyan Chohan, that Occult mysticism has to deal. The Worlds are all subject to Rulers or Regents—Rishis and Pitris with the Hindus, Angels with the Jews and Christians, Gods, with the Ancients in general. Each people and nation had its *direct* Watcher, Guardian and Father in Heaven —a Planetary Spirit. It is then the "Seven Sons of Light"—called after their planets and often identified with them—namely Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Venus, and—presumably for the modern critic, who

goes no deeper than the surface of old religions—Sun and Moon, which are, according to the Occult teachings, our heavenly parents, or "Father," synthetically. *"They* are neither sun, nor moon, nor stars, nor dawn, but the eternal sustainers of this luminous life which exists as it were behind all these phenomena." Saturn, Jupiter, Mercury, and Venus, the four exoteric planets, and the three others, which must remain unnamed, were the heavenly bodies in direct astral and psychic communication with the Earth, its Guides, and Watchers, morally and physically; the visible orbs furnishing our Humanity with its outward and inward characteristics, and their "Regents" or *Rectors* with our Monads and spiritual faculties.

Thus the Globe, propelled onward by the Spirit of the Earth and his six assistants, gets all its vital forces, life, and powers through the medium of the seven Planetary Dhyanis from the Spirit of the Sun. They are his messengers of Light and Life. Our Earth, as the visible representative of its invisible superior fellow globes, its "lords" or "principles," has to live, as have the others, through seven Rounds. During the first three, it forms and consolidates; during the fourth it settles and hardens; during the last three it gradually returns to its first ethereal form; it is spiritualized, so to say.

Analogy is the guiding law in Nature, the only true Ariadne's thread that can lead us, through all the inextricable paths of her domain, toward her primal and final mysteries. The Occult doctrine teaches that all sentient complete beings (full septenary men or higher beings) are furnished, in their beginnings, with forms and organisms in full harmony with the nature and state of the sphere they inhabit. Like each of the seven regions of the Earth, each of the seven First-born (the primordial human groups) receives its light and life from its own especial Dhyani, spiritually, and from the palace (house, the planet) of that Dhyani, physically; so with the seven great races to be born on it. So with every principle in man. Each gets its specific quality from its primary (the Planetary Spirit), therefore every man is a septenate (or a combination of principles, each having its origin in a quality of that special Dhyani). The "triads" born under the same Parent-planet, or rather the *radiation* of one and the same Planetary Spirit (Dhyani Buddha) are, in all their after-lives and rebirths, sister, or *"twin*-souls," on this Earth.

on the lookout

Response to Noëtic Psychology

In his recent lecture tour of the United States, Psychotherapist Viktor Frankl apparently encountered maximum audiences in every university community—attesting to the fact that, in Dr. Frankl's words, a natural hunger grows for "height" psychology, as well as "depth" psychology. Dr. Frankl asserts that there is a "noëtic" man, within or above the "psychic" man, that a sense of meaning in life can be awakened only by the noëtic and that the alternative leads to an "existential vacuum" of apathy or despair. This analysis now strikes response in a growing number of students and laymen, as well as in therapists and professors.

In the closing passages of *Man's Search for Meaning,* Frankl has shown that he does not regard himself as the only prophet in the wilderness, but simply as one whose Concentration Camp experience in World War II and his subsequent development of logotherapy have brought him a new "dream" concerning the spiritual potentialities of the human being. Dr. Frankl writes:

> For too long a time, for half a century in fact, psychiatry tried to interpret the human mind merely as a mechanism, and consequently the therapy of mental disease merely in terms of a technique. I believe this dream has been dreamt out. What now begins to loom on the horizon, are not the sketches of a psychologized medicine but rather those of a humanized psychiatry.

"Science" Against Man

A theosophically provocative volume, *The Crisis in Psychiatry and Religion,* by O. Hobart Mowrer, research professor of psychology at the University of Illinois (Van Nostrand, 1961), provides historical perspective on the results of those long-dominant trends in psychology which have eliminated not only the name, but also the idea, of "soul":

> In an attempt to separate the empirical from the speculative, the scientific from the metaphysical, psychology and its medical counterpart, psychiatry, made a determined effort to establish

themselves as independent enterprises. In certain limited respects, this separation or fissioning has been successful; but in other, perhaps more important ways, it has brought serious difficulties in its wake.

Psychoanalysis has always had (at least tacitly) a "value system," one in which "adult genital sexuality" (capacity for lusty heterosexual orgasm) and unencumbered "assertiveness" (which often eventuates as frank hostility and aggressiveness) occupy positions of supreme importance.

In psychiatry and clinical psychology there is now, belatedly, a growing realization that such a disingenuous amorality is more likely to *cause* than cure personality deviation and disorder.

Psychiatrist Thomas Szasz, in *The Myth of Mental Illness* (Hoeber-Harper, 1961), also speaks critically on this point:

Perhaps the relationship between the modern psychotherapist and his patient is a beacon that ever-increasing numbers of men will find themselves forced to follow, lest they become spiritually enslaved or physically destroyed. By this I do not mean anything so naive as to suggest that "everyone needs to be psychoanalyzed." On the contrary, "being psychoanalyzed"—like *any* human experience—can itself constitute a form of enslavement and affords, especially in its contemporary institutionalized forms, no guarantee of enhanced self-knowledge and responsibility for either patient or therapist.

The "Third Force" in Psychology

Prof. Abraham Maslow, in *Toward a Psychology of Being* (Van Nostrand, 1962), is similarly concerned when he suggests that a psychology which abdicates responsibility for considering man's higher or spiritual promptings brings us to a "pro-science" or "anti-science" dichotomy. As Dr. Maslow puts it: "Science has come into a kind of dead end, and (in some of its forms) can be seen as a threat and a danger to mankind, or at least to the highest and noblest qualities and aspirations of mankind. Many sensitive people, especially artists, are afraid that science besmirches and depresses, that it tears things apart rather than integrating them, thereby killing rather than creating."

All of these factors, then, contribute to the gradual emergence of a more comprehensive view of the field of psychology. Dr. Maslow provides an informative paragraph on the constituents of what he terms a "third force" in psychology:

The two comprehensive theories of human nature most influencing psychology until recently have been the Freudian and

the experimental-positivistic-behavioristic. All other theories were less comprehensive and their adherents formed many splinter groups. In the last few years, however, these various groups have rapidly been coalescing into a third, increasingly comprehensive theory of human nature, into what might be called a "Third Force."

From Jung to "Manas"

Dr. Maslow continues:

> This group includes the Adlerians, Rankians and Jungians, as well as all the neo-Freudians (or neo-Adlerians) and the post-Freudians (psychoanalytic ego-psychologists as well as writers like Marcuse, Wheelis, Marmor, Szasz, N. Brown, H. Lynd, and Schachtel, who are taking over from the Talmudic psychologists). In addition, the influence of Kurt Goldstein and his organismic-psychology is steadily growing. So also is that of Gestalt therapy, of the Gestalt and Lewinian psychologists, of the general-semanticists, and of such personality-psychologists as G. Allport, G. Murphy, J. Moreno and H. A. Murray. A new and powerful influence is existential psychology and psychiatry. Dozens of other major contributors can be grouped as Self-psychologists, phenomenological psychologists, growth-psychologists, Rogerian psychologists, humanistic psychologists, and so on and so on and so on. A full list is impossible. A simpler way of grouping these is available in the five journals in which this group is most apt to publish, all relatively new. These are the *Journal of Individual Psychology* (University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.), the *American Journal of Psychoanalysis* (200 W. 98th St., New York 25, N.Y.), the *Journal of Existential Psychiatry* (679 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago 11, Ill.), the *Review of Existential Psychology and Psychiatry* (Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa.), and the newest one, the *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* (2637 Marshall Drive, Palo Alto, Calif.). In addition, the journal *Manas* (P.O. Box 32112 El Sereno Station, Los Angeles 32, Calif.) applies this point of view to the personal and social philosophy of the intelligent layman.

Biological Clocks

An article by Alice Hills in *Life* (May 31, 1963), "Animals Can Tell Time—but How?," describes results of the continuing research by Dr. Frank Brown's group at Northwestern University (see THEOSOPHY 47:237-9) and additional work by Dr. Colin Pittendrigh, of Princeton. After noting that sea turtles swim over 1000 miles from Brazil to the Ascension Islands to lay their eggs, that homing pigeons fly miles to reach their home roosts, that fruit flies adjust the laying of eggs to the setting of the sun, etc., Miss Hills observes:

> Scientists would dearly like to solve the mystery; to find out just what animals use for clocks. Some of these clocks help creatures find their way. . . . Other biological clocks are used to regulate far different but equally vital animal activities—eating, say, or laying eggs. Moreover, incredibly enough, the clocks, whatever they are, go on ticking even when the animals are stashed away in laboratories where they live in conditions of controlled light and temperature, and thus are hidden from the obvious clues of the passage of time.

Résumé of Discoveries

Laboratory observation of crabs, snails, oysters, and fruit flies shows that the time clock works "in captivity" *as if* the creatures were in their native habitats. The article continues:

> Scientists have developed ingenious devices to monitor animal clock-watching in the field. . . . Much of this work is just starting, but we already know something about how the clocks work, if not why. Researchers have now found, for example, that in constant lab conditions the periods of animal clocks do not run exactly on a 24-hour day, but always very close to it; processes recur every 23½, 22 or 25 hours. Scientists call these rhythms "circadian," meaning in "about a day." Like mechanical clocks, these circadian rhythms can be easily reset. Scientists can adjust them to fit a 24-hour day exactly by exposing the animals to repeated 24-hour-timed shifts in light and dark. If birds with clocks thus shifted are then let out of the lab, they alter their angle or orientation to the sun by an angle corresponding exactly to the artificial time shift.

Major Theories

There are two theories to account for the observed responses. Dr. Brown's theory, first advanced in 1958, is that the "mainspring of the animal clock is outside him" and that an animal's "timer" depends on "continuous information from some outside, natural, terrestrial source." Dr. Pittendrigh's theory differs. The facts that "animal activities can be reset by light signals," and that "animals' rhythms, as seen in the lab, do not exactly parallel the earth's rotation," suggest to Dr. Pittendrigh that "the animal clock is a self-contained timer." The article continues:

> It is not a forced response to the geophysical forces grinding somewhere overhead, but a property of protoplasm itself. In Pittendrigh's view, the protoplasmic clock simply evolved with a period close to some significant cosmic period—the running of the tide or the rising of the sun—because this was an advantage to the life of the organism: it helped him eat or get around. . . .

> How, then, [Dr. Pittendrigh asks] can the timing devices of animals be activated by some geophysical variables depending on the spinning of the earth?

Some Implications of Biological Rhythms

While it may be that the time mechanism of animals is the result of "some still-undetermined chemical activity," as Miss Hills suggests, or "the natural property of protoplasm," as Dr. Pittendrigh phrases it, the research continues in the hope that it will furnish "practical" benefits. For example:

> The Navy and Air Force are interested because they would like to bring the simplicity and precision of animal timers to the bulky, complex machines which help their ships and planes find their way around. Doctors are interested because health apparently is related to the smooth operation of an internal clock. Chick embryos survive more operations at one time of day than another. Toxic drugs aid mice at one time of day, kill them at another. This means that some day there may be a best time of day for people to take medicine or to undergo surgery. For man is an animal, and the same subtle clocks are ticking away inside him, even while he stares at the mechanical ones on the wall.

Perhaps there is a further possibility; even though such studies are largely confined to observing the *mechanics* of behavior, these efforts may lead intuitive scientists toward a non-mechanistic theory of causation—an "intelligence principle," so to say, as a *primordial* property of protoplasm. "Where is that daring man," asks H. P. Blavatsky (*S.D.* I, 277fn.), "who would presume to deny to vegetation and even to minerals *a consciousness of their own?* All he can say is, that this consciousness is beyond his comprehension." (See also *Index* to *S.D.,* under Protoplasm.)

Review of Hodgson's "Exposé" of H.P.B.

Evidencing detailed and prolonged research into an investigation of the last century which has been of especial interest to Theosophists, *Obituary, The "Hodgson Report" on Madame Blavatsky. 1885—1960,* by Adlai E. Waterman (Adyar, Theosophical Publishing House, 1963), is designed to vindicate H. P. Blavatsky from charges made in the well-known report. Mr. Waterman expresses his own position:

> Any would-be apologist for H.P.B. cannot fall back on philosophical exposition in lieu of specific well-supported replies to what skeptics may bring in guise of concrete disproof and verified accusation against her. That kind of reaction may appeal to a

certain type of mind which can voluntarily blind itself to unpleasant shortcomings while taking refuge in philosophic abstractions. But such retreat is no substitute for knowledge and courage—or for whatever gratitude the followers of Mme. Blavatsky think they owe to their great Teacher. Neither is it the kind of answer the world respects or that Science demands. What is required in a situation such as this are *facts*—incontrovertible facts founded on testimony which incredulous critics cannot assail, *the testimony not of H.P.B. and her witnesses but of the principal prosecutor and his chief witnesses.*

Importance of Phenomena

While recognizing that there are those who hold that H.P.B.'s "occult phenomena, true or false, are not today of any moment or importance in theosophical thought," the author takes a contrary position:

Anyone crediting Theosophy as expounded in the written works of H. P. Blavatsky cannot—without endangering his philosophical foundations—afford to ignore the far-reaching moral and vital implications of the question of the authenticity of her occult or psychic phenomena . . . It is unthinkable that a practised deceiver, stooping low in vile conspiracy to hoodwink her faithful followers by elaborate fraudulent devices, would at the same time be a chosen vessel for the highest kind of spiritual truth and moral guidance, or the occult-endowed associate of such exalted human beings as the Mahatmas of Theosophy!

An Unfair Inquiry

An exhaustive analysis of all relevant points in the Hodgson Report follows Mr. Waterman's statement of his position. Included are plans of the Shrine and the Occult Room which figured in the report, enabling the reader to see for himself the setting of an "investigation" which resulted in—

More than *half an hundred* clever misconstructions, all wonderfully calculated to further the destruction of Mme. Blavatsky; all skillfully executed, buttressing each other or prudently protected by the suppression of contrary testimony or evidence wherever threatened; and almost every one requiring discriminating, conscious design, cautious framing or phrasing, and careful, cunning introduction and use.

The result of his study, which, incidentally, he is continuing in view of the disclosure of further evidence, has led Mr. Waterman to the conclusion that the *"lapses of memory"* and *"mal-observations"* committed by Richard Hodgson were not honest mistakes,

but represent a conscious attempt to found and sustain a single thesis—the guilt of Madame Blavatsky, the fraudulent nature of her phenomena. That this *Obituary* will lay that ghost is a probable result, if it gains a fraction of the currency given to the original Report. Students may refer to the chapter in *The Theosophical Movement* on "The London Society for Psychical Research" to find a discussion of this report in a larger context. They will find there the statement: "Hodgson, it seems, gave way to his predisposition to believe Madame Blavatsky guilty of fraud; his impartiality succumbing to prejudice, he became the self-righteous representative of conventional society—its defender against any disturber of the status quo and its well-established beliefs."

Computer Analyzes Paul's (?) Epistles

A full-page account in the Nov. 3 *Observer* (London) describes in detail how an electric computer is adding new evidence to the hundred-year-old controversy about the authenticity of the epistles generally attributed to the apostle Paul. The *Observer* sketches the background and importance of this controversy:

> A hundred years ago a school of theologians at Tübingen University, Germany, founded by F. C. Baur, sought to show that only four of the 14 epistles of St. Paul were actually written by him. In the course of their arguments they uncovered many confusions and contradictions in the Bible, which up till then had been regarded as sacrosanct; as a result, they were reviled as no New Testament scholars have been reviled before or since. For if they were right it would be necessary not only to revise our whole conception of Paul and of the history of the early Church, but also to abandon some of the central doctrines of the Christian faith.
>
> Not surprisingly, the works of Baur and his disciples were placed on the Index of books prohibited by the Roman Catholic Church, and have remained there ever since.

Methods; Findings; Implications

The experiments with the computer have been conducted by Prof. G. H. C. Macgregor (now deceased), of Glasgow University, and the Rev. A. Q. Morton, a minister of the Church of Scotland. Mr. Morton, writer of the *Observer* article, explains the general theory of literary analysis: "The problem of establishing the authorship of an Epistle is not in principle difficult. All that needs to be done is to discover some unconscious literary habits that can be traced in everything an author writes . . . so a variety of texts must

be searched to catch all the influences that change an author's style." Mr. Morton sums up:

> Now, by the use of modern scientific techniques, including the operation of a computer, Baur and his colleagues have been vindicated and it has been proved beyond reasonable doubt that Paul himself wrote only four major Epistles—Romans, Corinthians, Galatians and Philemon. Theologians all over the Christian world now have to face the implications of this discovery. They must change their view of the life of Paul, they must revise the history of the early Church and they must jettison doctrines that have now been shown to be without foundation.
>
> The authority of the Church as the interpreter of the Bible must go. And eschatology, the doctrine of the last things, expounded in various ways in different Epistles and comfortably explained up till now as stages in Paul's development, dissolves into a number of conflicting views held by rival factions.

Laymen Interested; Theologians Apathetic

In a separate article, the *Observer* notes that of those interested in Mr. Morton's demonstrations in Canada and the United States, only one New Testament scholar (at the University of Chicago) is included; all others are members of the departments of classics and romance languages and researchers in computing laboratories. Mr. Morton explains, in large degree, why this is so:

> One of Baur's most controversial conclusions relates to the Apostolic Succession. Baur saw the story of the early Church as a bitter struggle between Peter and Paul in which Paul's view that Christianity was a new religion prevailed. To Baur the Apostolic Succession therefore began with Peter and ended with Paul. Baur's view of Paul was based on his reading the Epistles as an historian. And if he is right about the authorship of the Epistles, then his historical judgment must be respected in other matters, too.
>
> For there is no escaping the consequences of this discovery for Christian theology. When it turns out that what were supposed to be stages in one man's development were in fact competing views, radical changes are inevitable. . . .
>
> There is a real sense in which religious belief is hardly ever changed by new knowledge about the Bible. People have always read the Bible in the light of their own experiences. It is perfectly possible to read and enjoy an Epistle for its warmth and human interest without caring who wrote it. But for Churches, theologians and New Testament scholars, these new discoveries raise very serious issues.